

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,217	02/27/2002	Sunit B. Mangalvedhekar	014208.1482 (05-01-011)	6980
5073	7590	06/29/2004	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			COBY, FRANTZ	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2171	

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/085,217

Applicant(s)

MANGALVEDHEKAR, SUNIT B.

Examiner

Frantz Coby

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01-08-04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

This is in response to application filed on February 27, 2002 in which claims 1-32 are presented for examination.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-32 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed on January 08, 2004 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 16, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Meske et al. U.S. Patent no. 5,530,852.

As per claims 1, 25 Meske et al. disclose "a method for preparing files for storage in a server comprising: generating a profile for a selected file, the profile identifying the at least one associated file as associated with the selected file (Col. 6, line 38_Col. 7,

line 29); and transmitting, to a server, the selected file, the profile, and the at least one associated file" (See Meske et al. Figures 1-2; Col. 2, line 20-Col. 3, line 9).

As per claim 16, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. Notice that generating a file and transmitting a file has been discussed above. In addition, Meske et al. disclose the claimed limitations of "for each level of the descendent files, generating a profile for each descendent file in the level, the profile identifying all of the descendent files that are immediately associated with the descendent file as immediately associated with the descendent file" (See Meske et al. Figures 6A-6B; Col. 6, line 52-Col. 7, line 29).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2-15, 17-24, 26-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meske et al. U.S. Patent no. 5,530,852 in view of Siefert U.S. Patent no. 5,721,906.

As per claim 2, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above.

It is noted, however, Meske et al. did not specifically detail the claimed feature of "after transmitting the selected file, the profile, and the at least one associated file, initiating downloading of the selected file from the server; identifying the at least one associated file by examining the profile; and in response to identifying the at least one associated file by examining the profile, initiating downloading of the at least one associated file from the server" downloading resources (See Siefert Col. 4, lines 15-45; Col. 15, lines 31-40; Col. 11, lines 10-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Meske et al. wherein the client server system provided thereof (See Meske et al. Figures 1-2) would have incorporated the method of downloading files as taught by Siefert. The motivation being to permit management of resources

As per claim 3, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, both Meske et al. and Seifert disclose "wherein the profile identifies the at least one associated file using a Uniform Resource Locator" because of their being in the Internet environment (See Meske et al. Figure 4; See Seifert Figures 1A-1E).

As per claims 4-6, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Seifert disclose the claimed features of "associating a globally unique identifier with each of the files, wherein the profile additionally identifies the at least one associated file by the respective globally unique identifiers"; "after transmitting the selected file, the profile, and the at least one associated file, determining if any of the at least one associated file is a missing file, wherein the missing file is any of the at least one associated file that has a different identifier than the identifier used by the profile to identify the at least one associated file; and searching, using a globally unique identifier associated with each of the at least one associated file, for the missing file"; "determining the different identifier of the missing file; and updating the profile with the different identifier for the missing file" (see Seifert et al. Figures 1A-1E).

As per claim 7, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Meske et al. disclose "receiving, at the server, the selected file, the profile, and the at least one associated file; and indexing, at the

server by a document manager residing in the server, the profile" (See Meske et al. (See Meske et al. Figures 6A-6B; Col. 6, line 52-Col. 7, line 29).

As per claim 8, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 2 above. In addition, Seifert discloses "storing the at least one associated file in a memory associated with a client under a local identifier" (See Seifert col. 23, lines 14-23; col. 5, lines 30-36).

As per claim 9, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claims 1-2. It is therefore rejected as set forth above.

As per claim 10, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 9 above. In addition, both Meske et al. and Seifert disclose "wherein the profile identifies the at least one associated file using a Uniform Resource Locator" because of their being in the Internet environment (See Meske et al. Figure 4; See Seifert Figures 1A-1E).

As per claims 11-13, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 9 above. In addition, Meske et al. disclose the claimed features of "associating a globally unique identifier with each of the files, wherein the profile additionally identifies the at least one associated file by the respective globally unique identifiers"; "after transmitting the selected file, the profile, and the at least one

associated file, determining if any of the at least one associated file is a missing file, wherein the missing file is any of the at least one associated file that has a different identifier than the identifier used by the profile to identify the at least one associated file; and searching, using a globally unique identifier associated with each of the at least one associated file, for the missing file"; "determining the different identifier of the missing file; and updating the profile with the different identifier for the missing file" (see Meske et al. Figures 1A-1E).

As per claim 14, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 9 above. In addition, Meske et al. disclose "receiving, at the server, the selected file, the profile, and the at least one associated file; and indexing, at the server by a document manager residing in the server, the profile" (See Meske et al. (See Meske et al. Figures 6A-6B; Col. 6, line52-Col. 7,line 29).

As per claim 15, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 9 above. In addition, Seifert disclose "storing the at least one associated file in a memory associated with a client under a local identifier" (See Seifert col. 23, lines 14-23; col.5, lines 30-36).


As per claims 17-24, 26-32, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 3-8, 9-15, 16 and 25. They are therefore rejected as set forth above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantz Coby whose telephone number is 703 305-4006. The examiner can normally be reached on Maxi-Flex (Monday-Saturday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703 308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Frantz Coby
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2171

June 26, 2004